

dealing with those that have been in existence five years it is not dealing with those which have not been in existence five years. So if you want to turn this negative statement which might be confusing into an affirmative statement it would say, that this proposition that you are talking about amending allows the enactment of laws providing for the licensing and regulation of these associations which have been in existence for five years. So if anything it might be saying that you cannot enact laws related to those that have been in existence less than five years. But if I were an organization and I was going to run a bingo game and my organization had been in existence for less than five years this provision of the Constitution would not stop me from operating and I think that before an amendment such as the one Senator Morehead is proposing would be added to this bill, and I am opposed to the bill whether that amendment is on it or not, you should look very carefully at what restriction is being imposed by the words that exist in the Constitution right now. A lot of times when you read a statute or a provision in the Constitution, the more you read it, the less clear it becomes just as if you repeat your name over and over and over. Pretty soon it loses sense and is just a sound that conveys no meaning whatsoever so you have to leave it alone for a while, then come back and the word then takes on a meaning. If you read this provision over and over and over, then the sense of it will be lost. But if you leave it for a moment, then go back and read just what it says, there may be a loophole created here by the Constitution but if it does it is not one which says that those in existence less than five years cannot operate. It may be saying that those in existence for less than five years are not subject to licensing or regulation. I don't think the amendment is necessary for Senator Morehead's purposes and if those organizations such as the Eagles, the Elks and Mooses and all the others who name themselves after animals have legal counsel of any kind they could fight against a prohibition of them receiving or against them receiving a license. I don't think the amendment is necessary in other words and I know I may have lost a lot of you but if you read the provision while I am not talking I think it will be clear what I have been trying to say.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Labedz, do you wish to speak to the amendment?